AO 241 (Rev. 09/17)

PETITION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2254 FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY A PERSON IN STATE CUSTODY



						the last of the la	The state of the s	
United States District Court			District:			a:23-cv-00637		
Name (ı	under which you were convicted): JAZN	is hue	e V a	NO		Docket or Case		
Place of	f Confinement: Higher vaio	+			Prisoner No.:	1655	2011	
32	ol Fm 929-Cateri	lla, Tx	.76	197		1633		
JA	er (include the name under which you were convicted of the ELUELAND if you were convicted if you were convicted or the second of	d) v.	C	· Z · 1	Acin Ge	naving custody of pet	VA. J	
	orney General Can C	1 in A	- 1				Esjete	
1110 1111	V.S.	440						
		PETIT	ION		FUNIX	ams -1	16 >	
					, , , ,		. 7	
1.	(a) Name and location of court that entered	ed the judgmen	nt of c	onviction	vou are challe	nging:		
1.	(a) Frame and recurrent of equity that officers	ou the juaginer			-		DAFARACT	
		£			Long	1 Ch	DA FABASE	
					.,	61	/	
	(b) Criminal docket or case number (if yo	nı know):			L _l	1	4 (
2.	(a) Date of the judgment of conviction (if			92	4	· 9		
2.	(b) Date of sentencing:	you know).			4 4	1 11	01	
3.	Length of sentence:				ol u	()	((
4.	In this case, were you convicted on more	than one cour	nt or of	f more th		'Yes	□ No	
5.	Identify all crimes of which you were con						nata Bus	
5.	identify all effiles of which you were con	ivicica and so	inchec	d III tills		in poren	Wallet 130 SE	
					11	4	1/ 1/	
					4			
		E.				(4)	9	
					1000	<u>4</u>	<u> </u>	
					7	v ¹		
6	(-) What was a sum of - 9 (Ob - 1)				n u	<i>V</i> -	· (
6.	(a) What was your plea? (Check one)	· · · · · ·	_	(2)	N. I.			
		guilty		(3)		ere (no contest)		
	☐ (2) Gui	lty		(4)	Insanity plea			

AO 241 (Rev. 09/17)

	(6) Did you receive a hearing where evidence was given on your petition, application, or motion?					
	7 Yes No (7) Result: Competer DAIN Base					
	(8) Date of result (if you know):					
	(d) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction over the action taken on your petition, application,					
	or motion?					
	(1) First petition:					
	(2) Second petition: Tyes Dynamic No					
	(3) Third petition: Yes					
	(e) If you did not appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction, explain why you did not:					
	Competer DAtaBAIE					
	Competer DATABATE					
12.	For this petition, state every ground on which you claim that you are being held in violation of the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. Attach additional pages if you have more than four grounds. State the facts supporting each ground. Any legal arguments must be submitted in a separate memorandum.					
	CAUTION: To proceed in the federal court, you must ordinarily first exhaust (use up) your available state-court remedies on each ground on which you request action by the federal court. Also, if you fail to set forth all the grounds in this petition, you may be barred from presenting additional grounds at a later date. UND ONE: C T P d A F D C E					
	upporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.):					
10 20	A. in D.C. OF Public AFTAIR 20505 Nequelt For U.S. Dift. Dedper of Vingini					
AL	Mequell for U.S. Mill Scoter of Ungen,					
0 0	ompél the C.Z.A. to pet mg CASE n the C.Z.A. Podeast - And - the npél ondens Fon An Zwertigation V.S. Sepnene Judge Thomas Special Dinners					
	A The C. L.A. PODEATI - And - The					
COR	ngol onder jon ha thetheation					
(b) If	you did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground One, explain why:					
(0) 11	you did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground One, explain why.					

AO 241 (Rev. 09/17) (e) Other Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative remedies, etc.) that you have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground One: **GROUND TWO:** (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): C.Z.A. in washing D.C. Information send to them? HAI BEEG FILE in your sta Vinginia Back in EC PASC -(b) If you did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two, explain why: Direct Appeal of Ground Two: (c) (1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue? ☐ Yes □ No (2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why: (d) **Post-Conviction Proceedings:** (1) Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a state trial court? ☐ Yes 🗖 No (2) If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state: Type of motion or petition: Name and location of the court where the motion or petition was filed:

Docket or case number (if you know):

AO 241 (Rev. 09/17)

	Date of the court's decision:	(01	inpute	n 111	FOL SAJ
	Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):	_(/	· ' (۲,	(,
		<u> </u>	4	4	4
		-4-	u	(ε,
	(3) Did you receive a hearing on your motion or petition?	(Yes Yes	□ No
	(4) Did you appeal from the denial of your motion or petition?			Yes	□ No
	(5) If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," did you raise this iss	ue in th	e appeal?	Yes	□ No
	(6) If your answer to Question (d)(4) is "Yes," state:				a.
	Name and location of the court where the appeal was filed:	0 m	puter	Dag	ta Pasa
		U.		(((.,
	Docket or case number (if you know):	4	٠,	((
	Date of the court's decision:	Ч	<i>l</i> (c l
	Result (attach a copy of the court's opinion or order, if available):	4	٠((1	((
		4	(٥(۲(
		٥(• (c (· L
	(7) If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," ex	plain w	ny you did 1	not raise this i	ssue:
		L1	C(U	U
		ч	<i>(</i> (4	61
		4	<i>(</i> (ų	41
		ч ((<i>(</i> (ц ((۲1 ٤ (
(e)	Other Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas c	((orpus, a	((((٤ (
(e)	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:	6	dministrativ	e remedies, e	tc.) that you No Fee Br
(e)	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:	6	dministrativ	e remedies, e	tc.) that you No Fee Br
(e)	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:	6	dministrativ	e remedies, e	tc.) that you No Fee Br
	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:	<i>C</i>	dministrativ	((// re remedies, e // e // // // // // // // // // // // // //	tc.) that you MA FUB CC CC CC CC CC CC CC CC CC
	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:	<i>C</i>	dministrativ	((// re remedies, e // e // // // // // // // // // // // // //	tc.) that you MA FUB CC CC CC CC CC CC CC CC CC
	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two:	<i>C</i>	dministrativ	((// re remedies, e // e // // // // // // // // // // // // //	tc.) that you MA FUB CC CC CC CC CC CC CC CC CC
GROU (a) Sup	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two: (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Control of the Contro	dministrativ	re remedies, e fen f f f f f f f	tc.) that you My fol Bi (() () q () q () Rot Bot Homas
GROU (a) Sup The	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two: (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Constitution of the consti	dministrativ	re remedies, e Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le	tc.) that you My fal Br (1 4) (1 4) (1 4) Bot Homas Alexander
GROU (a) Sup The	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two: (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Constitution of the consti	dministrativ	re remedies, e Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le	tc.) that you My fal Br (1 4) (1 4) (1 4) Bot Homas Alexander
GROU (a) Sup The	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two: (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Constitution of the consti	dministrativ	re remedies, e Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le	tc.) that you My fal Br (1 4) (1 4) (1 4) Bot Homas Alexander
GROU (a) Sup The	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two: (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Constitution of the consti	dministrativ	re remedies, e Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le	tc.) that you My fal Br (1 4) (1 4) (1 4) Bot Homas Alexander
GROU (a) Sup The	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two: (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Constitution of the consti	dministrativ	re remedies, e Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le	tc.) that you My fal Br (1 4) (1 4) (1 4) Bot Homas Alexander
GROU (a) Sup The	have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Two: (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	Constitution of the consti	dministrativ	re remedies, e Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le Le	tc.) that you My fal Br (1 4) (1 4) (1 4) Bot Homas Alexander

AO 241 (Rev. 09/17) (7) If your answer to Question (d)(4) or Question (d)(5) is "No," explain why you did not raise this issue: Other Remedies: Describe any other procedures (such as habeas corpus, administrative remedies, etc.) that you (e) have used to exhaust your state remedies on Ground Three: Counter 10 11 to 15 GROUND FOUR: FIF to (Sta) Cincit cleaker FROM MORSEA R. LEASHING top U.S. Cincil Tulses (a) Supporting facts (Do not argue or cite law. Just state the specific facts that support your claim.): 1 CIACUIT JUDGES OF the FIFTE (5+91 A ring MOB ZNC. DUE to COULA-LA U.S. Dist count - Ar Zavertigation -1- RELEAL HAT TEXAL Tudges working Balenas LA. From Houston to SAN Ant Route Mone TENAL CINCUIT (b) If you did not exhaust your state remedies on Ground Four, explain why: HAVE try to fot U.S. SUPArine went to compet Dut Supreme wants Bribe (changes) cleaks to File My LASE-AS EXPOSE DIGNERS OF Direct Appeal of Ground Four: 12 NALLAI TX (1) If you appealed from the judgment of conviction, did you raise this issue? (2) If you did not raise this issue in your direct appeal, explain why: (d) **Post-Conviction Proceedings:** (1) Did you raise this issue through a post-conviction motion or petition for habeas corpus in a state trial court? ☐ Yes

(2) If your answer to Question (d)(1) is "Yes," state:

Type of motion or petition:

*The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: *Milical Falcol Shoffed by Vol. To lead; Par Tong (1) A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review; (A) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; (C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or the date on which the factural predicate of the fairm of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence. (S+4)	AO 241 (Rev. 09/17)
A leady Lane of Federal Provides By Collection of the control limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the Constitution of land and increased by State action in visional to the Constitution of right seared by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court adsorved through the exercise of due diligence.	CASE in this Pudent of C.Z.A.
AI CRIMEI in State County Using Federal AI CRIMEI in State County Using Federal FUNDION FROM THE PERSON TO LEAT WAR IN PAISON ALL LOKE HAVE BEEN ALT IN PAISON AI LOKE HAVE BEEN ALT IN FEDERAL PAISON WHAT IN A NEWLY LAME OF OF FEDERAL PRISON "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. \$2244(d) provides in 1914 "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S	Compet orders to C. Z. A. why potist
Al love have Been not in Federal Maison Al love have Been not in Federal Maison Al New Have Been not in Federal Maison Al New Have Been not in Federal Maison Al New Have Been not in Federal Maison My CASE is not moving Dee to U.S. Terras "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in Custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in Violation of the Constitution of laws from the Constitution of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; In Maison	of Allephona Hearings -on- Any
heep an Innotest wan in Paison At love Have Been put in Federal Prison At A New Year out of Federal Prison "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review; Out of the date on which the judgment to filing an application created by State action inviolation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; The Math of the Armonical Provides the Constitutional Pight asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or The Math (D) the date on which the factural predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	
Allege An Innolege with a Paison Allege Have Been pet in Federal Phison Allegely Lane out of Federal Phison "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in register that: While Fared of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of- (A) the date on which the judgment to falling an application created by State action in violation of the time for seeking such review; (B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or The DAULA (D) the date on which the factural predicate of the faim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence. (5 + 4)	
A least take Beeg not is Federal Phisos And Already Lane out of Federal Phisos "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: "The Antiterrorism and Effecti	FUNDI OF REOPLET TAX DOLLARI USE to
*The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: **The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: **M Miley Falsed ONDFA! By U.G. U. Conft! Pan Tang (1) A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review; (A) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; (A) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or **The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The Antity Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in The	heep de Tanolest man in Paison
*The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: **The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in part that: **M Miley Faked of the Faked of the Faked of the Judgment of a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review; **Connected by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filling by such state action; **The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in Judgment of the Act of the Experiment of the Act of the Experiment of the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or **The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in Judgment of the Experiment of the E	
(1) A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of - (A) the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review; (B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; (C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or The Matter of the date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	And Alnerdy Tane out of Federal Paison
(1) A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of - (A) the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review; (B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; (C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or The Matter of the date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	my CASE is not moving DIE to U.S. Texas
(1) A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. The limitation period shall run from the latest of the date on which the judgment became final by the conclusion of direct review or the expiration of the time for seeking such review; (B) the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; (C) the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or The DMUA (D) the date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	* The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA") as contained in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) provides in
of the time for seeking such review; the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action inviolation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or the date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	(1) A one-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in
the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from filing by such state action; the date on which the constitutional right asserted was initially recognized by the Supreme Court, if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or The date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	
The fight has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to cases on collateral review; or the date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	the date on which the impediment to filing an application created by State action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States is removed, if the applicant was prevented from
the date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the exercise of due diligence.	if the right has been newly recognized by the Supreme Court and made retroactively applicable to
(Nime) at Expanta Cialit	The little date on which the factual predicate of the claim of claims presented could have been discovered through the everying of due diligence
Communications Page 15 of 16	Communiction / Page 15 of 16

AO 241 (Rev. 09/17)

(2) The time during which a properly filed application for State post-conviction or other collateral review with respect to the pertinent judgment or claim is pending shall not be counted toward any period of limitation under this subsection.
Therefore, petitioner asks that the Court grant the following relief: To Do Compet and Toward
FORWARD COPY to C.I.A. OFFICE in Vinginia
DUA Rétesting is not Being dogs nue to Lost DNA
or any other relief to which petitioner may be entitled. See AHACH Copier of the Fifth (5th) Cincuit
Clerki Monica Vershington etc.
Ugilal PEN Jung Not 10 Signature of Attorney (if any)
FILE APPEACIOF TEXAL U.S. COUNTY??
I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus was placed in the prison mailing system on Dopt 18 (month, date, year).
Executed (signed) on Sept. 18, (date). Executed (signed) on Sept. 18, (date). DouconEntly Please
Vola Rings mobs of Thanks
TENAI TUDGET OF PARIS 1
Fifty Cinerit (5+5) Joine Luguaro
to U.S. Scancer Upphr? Signature of Petitioner
If the person signing is not petitioner, state relationship to petitioner and explain why petitioner is not signing this petition.

(Franklast)